

WHOLE NO. 934.

y or Captain Bragg on the mission. Or, if the church, at large, were to

should both go—one with his sermon, and the other with his grape, that the needed conversion might be the more speedy and thorough.—[Ohio Free Press.

FRATERNITY OF RACES.

The Democratic Pacificque gives a highly interesting report of the proceedings of a grand banquet of Philansterians at Paris, Oct. 21st. The following extract from it is peculiarly gratifying:—

"One episode had particularly excited enthusiasm in our Philansterian festival. The representative of the people, M. Charles Duin, who was charged with presenting the toast: *To the emancipation of all peoples*, appeared at the tribune having at his elbow

M. Pory-Papy, belonging to the class of color, is a member of the bar of Martinique. M. Mathieu is a fine specimen of a negro, of the purest ethion : a man of the people of the tropics. M. Dain, the white creole, almost his hand to the table.

presented them to this assembly of the white race. In the colonies, it is the man of color who is to place himself in the centre, and serve as the fraternal bond between the black and white.

At the sight of this group, united in such a Christian manner, and in this mood, too, of the tropical trees, one tremendous acclamation burst forth, ten times repeated and prolonged with transport. Especially did a sympathetic cry from all hearts respond to these words: *May our sacrifice and our love henceforth procure the pardon of our secular tyranny!*

Here is the toast pronounced by M. Duin :

TO THE EMANCIPATION OF ALL PEOPLES !

To the unity, to the final emancipation of all Germany !

May the bright irradiation of the democratic sunna dispense these visions of the night, these phantoms of clouds which we best bear waking ! May Germany, no longer ajourning, no longer the barbarous spirit of oppression and of conquest reach out a generous hand to her sisters, Hungary, Poland and Italy !

To Italy, which the last satellites of tyranny think to guard in a sepulchre, and which revives to overthrow them.

To France, which recalls to itself its ancient glory, and agitates its soul in its chains. To Prussia, whose chains monarchial France has riveted, but whose deliverance republican France shall salute !

To Ireland ! which has merited liberty by such long tortures ; to Ireland ! which dies with famine, and sets a price upon the heads of its children !

THE SLAVE-DRIVERS TAKING POSSESSION.

In Kentucky, organizations have been made for emigrating to California, and a "California Emigration Society" is established. Farther North the same proceedings will be repeated.

new territory armed bands of slaveholders. The Philadelphia R-public says, with truth and force:—
—[Albany Atlas.

The slaveholders know what they are about. Their deadly resistance to the Proviso is not an abstraction, and accordingly we find them organizing Colonization Societies for the purpose of occupying the ground and arraying their forces on the spot for the earliest and most desperate efforts to extend their system into the new country. It is to be occupied as Texas was, and for the same purpose. All they want is time to crowd the land

ed, and while the North is debating whether the Proviso is necessary, and whether Taylor will veto it, the propagandists are busy pushing forward their nefarious enterprise. It is not a non-committal, unpledged President that will arrest the mischief. Delay decisive legislative action as long as the Oregon bill was hanging in Congress, and the question will be one of abolition of slavery,

when, by this time, will have usurped the groins, and planted itself upon the right of possession. Actual, absolute, immediate prohibition—the Wilmon Proviso now, is the only security: every pretence and profession that delays the decision is a cheat. The annexation of Texas was accomplished by stealth. When Adams and Gates, and one or two other members of Congress, first warned the country of the danger, it seemed an impos-

sible that it was unheeded, but within a year or two from the time when the purpose was demonstrated, the scheme had triumphed over all obstacles, and the iniquity was consummated.'

GOVERNMENT.

To utter an opinion which shall be in the main

this: we have confounded *government of self* with a *government made by ourselves*; and we do not see clearly as we ought, that the latter can never be permanent and healthy unless it results from the former. It is possible to conceive of a people who have emancipated themselves from every restraint and tradition of authority, who acknowledge nothing as their master but the aggregate of their pri-

vate wills centered in the single man or their choice, who make and unmake their laws by the power of suffrage, who enjoy unparalleled comfort and prosperity, who have the right of unlimited development, in public, social, and external forms—and yet they may be an abandoned people, with their public freedom constantly degenerating into license and misrule, into the oppression and tyranny of an irresponsible majority, into violation of the freedom

of the delinquents, into the organization of sins instead of virtues, because they are not truly free; they may be the slaves of their passions, their caprices, and their unconverted wills. They have undertaken the awful task of conducting a government, before they have learned the first principle of governing themselves. Such a people is not entirely imaginary; we present some of its characteristics, for instance, we present as such private citizens

is the tool of his vices and desires, the victim of prejudice and want of thought, just so far will the government he assists in erecting, the laws he sanctions, the votes he casts, the measures which receive his countenance, be the direct expression of his inward slavery, his anarchy and misrule. And nothing can render this result less inevitable; not even the freest forms of polity conceived in

state spirits will warp and frustrate the finest measures, and render the most symmetrical forms of external liberty as shapeless and imperfect as the most odious scheme of tyranny.—*Boston Christian World.*

The N. O. Picayune says that a man named Wm. Johnson has been arrested in that city for stealing a

Seven runaway slaves ('big Ann's and little Ann's') passed through this city yesterday on their way to a land of freedom.—[Cleveland Plaindealer.



Lucy Stone followed upon the same subject.

Lucy Stone followed upon the same subject. Abby K. Foster continued the subject.

At 1 o'clock, voted to adjourn to meet at the usual time of the afternoon service in the church.

AFTERNOON SESSION. Met at 2, P. M., the President in the chair.

Voted to adopt the first resolution.

Resolution No. 2 was spoken to by Samuel May, and the meeting voted to adopt it.

Resolution No. 3 was spoken to by S. S. Foster and Parker Pillsbury, when the meeting adjourned to meet at 6-1-2 o'clock, P. M.

EVENING SESSION. Met according to adjournment, the President in the chair.

Resolved that the

Remarks were made upon the third resolution,
J. M. Fink, John Milton, Eagle, &c.

The remarks were made upon the third resolution, by J. M. Fisk, John Milton Earle, (in explanation of the objects of the Free Soil party,) Oliver Johnson Parker Pillsbury, Lucy Stone, Abby K. Foster, and S. S. Foster, and it was then adopted.

The remaining resolutions were then adopted.

Voted, That the proceedings of this meeting be sent to the Liberator and Massachusetts Spy, for publication.

JOHN. M. FISK, Sec.

AN APPEAL FOR JUSTICE.

The undersigned, a Committee appointed at a meeting held in Faneuil Hall in the month of May last, to take measures for the defence of Daniel Drayton, now confined in prison in the District of Columbia, on the charge of stealing slaves, beg leave to make the following statement:—

There was, and we suppose still is, in the District of Columbia, if not already sold off to the South a numerous family of colored persons by the name of Bell. Moses Bell, the father of this family, claimed his freedom by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, on the ground that he had been brought into the District contrary to law. Bell's wife and children claimed their freedom, also, under the will of her former owner. A suit was brought to enforce this claim, which failed, as we are informed, on account of some informality or other defect in the will. Expecting that his wife and children would be speedily sold off to the South, he obtained

to Philadelphia to solicit funds for their redemption.

Philadelphia to solicit funds for their redemption. A large sum would be required for that purpose. The persons seemed equitably entitled to freedom. The idea was started of sending a vessel to Washington to bring them away. Without any privy on the part of Bell, the case of his family was submitted to captain Drayton, and believing the Bells to be free and equitable if not in law, Drayton volunteered, on the payment of the necessary expenses, to procure a vessel, and to go with it to Washington to bring the Bells away.

Information of what was intended was communicated to a person at Washington, in order to give notice to the parties interested, and bring aware of the Edmondson girls,—those girls lately brought to the public notice, and redeemed from slavery and threatened prostitution by the liberality of some persons in New York,—he thought it would be a good opportunity for them to escape also. He communicated the opportunity to them and to several others; they communicated it to their friends; and when captain Drayton came to sail, instead of having several passengers, as he had expected, he had ten times that number.

Drayton was pursued overboard, and brought back to Washington. He had been guilty, of no offence, of the simple offence of transporting the slaves out of the District; but not *exporting* them.

finding seventy-four indictments against him on the

The trials of two of these indictments commenced upwards of a fortnight; and another fortnight was taken up with the trial of other cases connected with the matter. Contrary to an *express decision* lately made in Alabama, and other cases leaning the same way in other courts of the slave-holding States, and without the shadow of any authority in support of him, the presiding judge of the Criminal Court, Thomas H. Crawford, late of Pennsylvania, instructed the jury—That to constitute stealing, there need not be any design to convert the article taken to the taker's use; that any incidental gain in any kind was enough; that to hi-lp slaves to escape from their masters was stealing, if the person so helping, enticed or induced the slaves to go; and that in the present case, the freedom to be obtained by the slaves was a sufficient, technical cause, *lure*; that the

even under this most extraordinary ruling, by whi

even under this most extraordinary ruling, by which the best settled principles of the law of larceny were disregarded and set aside, there was no case made out against the prisoner. There was not the slightest evidence that Drayton had enticed or seduced the slaves, or any slave, to run away. In fact, he had never seen one of the company till he found them on board his vessel. Yet two juries, under the pressure of the outside mob, and the immoderate exhortations of the prosecuting officer, after being on each time some twenty-four hours, brought in verdicts of guilty, on which the Judge sentenced Drayton to twenty years imprisonment. Sayers, the master of

the vessel, charged also with stealing, was tr

the vessel, charged also with stealing, was tried on two indictments, on the very same evidence, and acquitted, when the other thirty nine indictments against him were abandoned.

Drayton's case is still open to review by the superior courts. The honor of the nation demands that such perversion of all law should be set aside. The funds hitherto contributed for the purposes of this case and others connected with it, amounting to \$994.75 in all, have been exhausted. As much more is needed to carry the matter to a successful conclusion; and for that sum, the committee confidently appeal to their humane and law-respecting

fellow-citizens. The money must be had at once

fellow-citizens. The money must be had at once
 and all persons disposed to contribute towards saving
 the law from being wickedly perverted, in a court
 of the United States, in the city of Washington, for
 the benefit of slavery, are requested to forward their
 contributions to JOSEPH F. BLANCHARD, Treasurer of
 the Committee, 13 Purchase st.

Editors favorable to the cause of humanity and
 justice are requested to contribute by giving this an
 insertion in their columns.

S. E. SEWALL,
 ROBERT MORRIS, JR.
 CHARLES LIST,
 JOHN W. BROWNE,
 RICH'D HILDRETH,
 WALTER CHANNING,
 ELIZUR WRIGHT,
 H. BOWDITCH,
 FRANCIS JACKSON,
 J. F. BLANCHARD,

JOS. SOUTHWICK,
Committee

JOS. SOUTHWICK,
Committee.

WORCESTER COUNTY, SOUTH.

It is not a quarterly (as we stated last week) but the *Annual* meeting of the Worcester Co. South Anti-Slavery Society, which is to take place on Saturday and Sunday next at North Brookfield. Let the members make a special effort to attend.

See notice in another column.—u.

The Fourth District.—The returns from all the towns in the Fourth District give

| | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 5392½ | Thompson. | Rehoboth. |
| 5455 | | 3140 |

At the Presidential election, Taylor had eleven hundred more votes than Van Buren. Mr. Palmer has made a noble gain upon that vote.

THE Taylor Electoral Ticket was chosen by the Legislature of Massachusetts on Friday last, by a vote of 150 yeas to 10 nays.

a majority of nearly one hundred.

a majority of nearly one hundred.

IS GOD UNJUST AND CHANGEABLE; OR
WERE THE WRITERS OF THE OLD TESTA-
MENT, IN SOME INSTANCES, MIS-
TAKEN?—NO. III.

FAIRMOUNT, Stark Co. Ohio.

To ANDREW PATON, Glasgow, Scotland;

DEAR ANDREW:

The last letter I addressed to you was written on board of a steamer, on Sunday, (Oct. 22,) going down the Ohio river. Since then, I have held meetings in war, in several places; and in all of which meetings a storm of sectarian and pro-war indignation has descended upon me, by reason of my preferring to believe that man is fallible, rather than admit that God is unjust and changeable. Shall I sacrifice God upon the altar of man's infallibility? Is God a compound of absurdities and contradictions—a demon of wrath, malice, revenge and blood; or were the writers of the Jewish Record, in some instances, mistaken? I prefer to believe those writers were, sometimes, mistaken.

These two persons, a man and wife, have just left my room. They came in to converse with me on the evil effects on children, of the practice of killing animals for food. They wish me to take the ground, that man has no right to live at the expense of animal life. I cannot agree that question with any one. I do believe it tends to harden the heart and blunt the moral perceptions of children, to see the slaughter of lambs, calves, and other animals for food. How much more, then, must it harden their hearts, and render their moral perceptions, and their sense of the death penalty, and the terrible slaughter of men, women, and children, that are recorded in the Jewish Scriptures? And what conception of God must they have, when told that he commanded and approved those deeds?

I am in a log house, in Ohio. It is a comfortable, happy home. To give some idea of the hospitality often found in these cabins of logs, I would say, that yesterday, Sunday, we held an anti-war meeting in Fairmount meeting-house, all day. Some came from ten and some twenty miles. In this log house, nine persons from abroad were entertained, and found comfortable food and bedding; and the family were not taken by surprise, nor were they put out, nor disturbed from their ordinary quietude, by the influx of company. For, in their cabin of logs, they had beds and bedding, and the choicest food—enough for all. I have seldom seen hospitality practiced on such a scale as I have seen it among the settlers in Ohio, and they make their company feel that they are welcome, and that the entertainers are the parties obliged. My experience has been among the reformers, the non-resistance and abolitionists, mainly. The man and wife, who were in this log house, also owned and cultivated 160 acres of land around it. They raise Indian corn, wheat, and oats, and vegetables of all kinds, and fruit, peaches, apples, pears, plums, and quinces, enough for their own use, and to sell. They have 300 sheep; several cows; horses to labor or travel with; a few large barns, and good out-houses of all kinds; a fine fruit orchard about the house. They have dried, for use during the coming year, for themselves and for sale, 40 bushels of peaches—taking five bushels of fresh peaches to make one of dried—thus taking 200 bushels of fresh peaches to make 40 of dried. They have made some eight or ten bushels of dried apples. These dried peaches and apples are an important article of food, and you could not probably at down at their table, during the coming year, without seeing peaches or apples on the table in the shape of pies or stewed sauce, as it is here called. Then you would find currant, cherry, or grape, or plum preserves, or jam, as they would call it. Never did I witness tables spread with such fresh, delicious, and choice food, as I have seen in these log cabins and farm houses of Ohio; and I never at these tables without wishing that the laborers of Europe could be here to eat, by industry, and enjoy these luxuries. This man and woman in whose hospitable home I am, till their own land, except the hiring of a man to aid them in time of harvest. The price of a hired laborer on land here, by the year, is 10 dollars (\$20 per month), and the employer feeds and lodges the laborer. This family raises 70 bushels of Indian corn, and 20 bushels of wheat, on an average, to the acre (English acre). The women, here, never work on the land, except it be among the new comers from Germany and Ireland; but these soon leave the outdoor work to the men, and the women do the indoor work. Tending cattle, sheep and horses, in winter or summer, is entirely the business of men. The women in Europe often do this work, as well as work on the land. To see this man and woman with their group of young children, in an anti-war or anti-slavery meeting, you would never dream that they lived in a log house, so profusely furnished with all that is comfortable, or that they were laborers on the land. And then their interest and intelligence on all the great questions that agitate this nation, and the nations of Europe! And they are but a specimen of their neighbors around them. I look out of my window upon a belt of native forests, the growth of centuries, and upon the stumps that surround me. The forests are now stripped of their glorious foliage, and look bare and desolate. I cannot but look back 50 years, my own term of existence—and see this an unbroken wilderness; and now, the energy and industry of man have felled the mighty forests, and opened them to human habitation, and made the wilderness to bud and blossom as the rose.

But, dear Andrew, I have strayed from my subject. No matter. Life is a queer compound. So is my letter. All the better. It will be more lifelike.

The following resolutions were passed yesterday, in a large meeting, without a dissenting voice—

Resolved, That some of the deeds, said to have been done by the express command and approval of God, are opposed to the Divine nature, to the Christian religion, and to the unchangeable relations and duties of man to man; and, therefore, those writers were mistaken when they asserted that God commanded and approved those deeds.

Resolved, That those who father upon God the pen of law and aggression, exterminating wars of the Old Testament virtually deny his justice, benevolence, and immutability. They represent God as unjust and changeable, rather than admit that man may be mistaken; they sacrifice God upon the altar of man's infallibility.

Resolved, That it is wiser, more Christian, more rational, more just, and more humane, to admit that the writers of the Old Testament were in some instances mistaken, than to believe that God is unjust, malevolent and changeable.

You are well aware of the excitement these resolutions would create, in a community trained to believe that the writers of the Old Testament were infallible, and that God actually did every thing which they ascribe to him. Two men, followers of Alexander Campbell, came forward yesterday, and stoutly maintained that nothing could be known of the character of God, except through the Bible, and that every sentence and word of the O. and N. T. were the words of God; and that if we rejected one sentence, as being erroneous, we must reject the whole. To escape my conclusions, they would not admit that those wars and penalties would not be opposed to the nature of God. Day before yesterday, Sunday, in a meeting, eight miles distant, a Presbyterian build over with sectarian wrath, and told me that he was astonished that God did not strike me dead, and send me to hell, for uttering such blasphemous as those contained in the above resolutions. He expected to see me fall dead, as I was speaking. He was very wrathful about it. He declared that God did authorize the avenger of blood to put to death the man, who accidentally killed

another, though 'he knew him to be perfectly innocent'; and that God did command Joshua to put to death innocent children, because their fathers stole; and that I denied all distinctions between justice and injustice, because I denied it. He now was thoroughly furious in defence of the Old Testament. At New Brighton, a week ago, a Presbyterian came forward in a meeting, and declared me to be the greatest blasphemer he ever heard; that he had ten times been tempted to leave the meeting; that I had slandered the Old Testament saints, and cast contempt upon God. 'Would those wars and deeds be in accordance with the Divine nature now?' I asked. 'Yes,' said he; 'God has a right to require us to kill our prisoners of war—the male children and married women, and to give the unmarried ones to the men for their use; God has a right to require us to invite a man into our house, under the offer of friendship and protection, and then, when we have him in, and asleep, to require us to stab him; God has a right to require a father to sacrifice his children, and to stone them for disobedience; a right to command us to wage an exterminating war, and to slaughter every man, woman and child, even though they never entertained one unkind thought towards us.' He declared these would be in perfect harmony with the nature of God. 'Would you receive Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Gideon, Samson, David and Solomon into your Presbyterian church, if they were living in New Brighton now, and were to do as we are told they did then?' 'I believe they were pious, godly men,' said he. 'But would you receive them into your church?' I asked. 'I wish the church to which I belong was made up of as good and holy men,' said he. 'It may all be true that the Presbyterian church is made up of worse men than those who had many wives and concubines, and perpetrated deeds that would now consign them to the dungeon or gallows; but that does not answer the question—Would you take them into your church?' He repeated that he wished the church now was made up of as good men—and this was all he would say.

Recently, at a discussion in Andover, Ohio, my opponent, rather than admit the possibility that the Old Testament writers were mistaken, in any case, declared that the whole penal code of the Jews was based upon us, and that parents were bound now to stone their children to death for disobedience. Yesterday, my two opponents took the ground, that we have no knowledge of right and wrong, of justice and injustice, and of the attributes of God, except through the Bible. They admitted that the existence of God might be known without the book, but that we could learn nothing of his character without it, and have no idea of right and wrong.

THE BIBLE THE ONLY INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE: It is a monstrous delusion, by whomsoever uttered, and a falsehood. So far from being an infallible rule, no rule can be more fallible. In the nature of the case, there can be no infallibility about it. What is the Bible? A book, written by very many men, who lived in different ages of the world—and extending over a period of thousands of years—and written in fragments, that were preserved by transcribers, and constantly liable to mistakes. Many of the compositions are from unknown authors, and the canon, or books, settled by a council of corrupt and dissolute men as ever met together. That book has an infinite variety of interpretations. Nothing can be fixed and settled as certain truth about it, as a whole, though its moral precepts are perfectly plain. This book is called infallible, as a whole—and it is said to be a sin of the deepest dye to doubt or question the truth of any one passage in it!

One fact is strikingly prominent in the history of the Bible. It has ever been made to conform to popular opinion. The Bible imprisoned Galileo as an infidel, but when his opinions of astronomy were commonly received, the Bible came round, and declared it never taught a different doctrine. The Bible (I mean always as received by the Church and Clergy) now sanctions slavery. In a few years, that same book will declare that it never did and never can sanction it. The Bible now declares war to be just and godlike; in a few years it will deny that it ever sanctioned war. The Bible, as received by the advocates of the gallows and sword, declares that God has commanded disobedient children, Sabbath-breakers, idolaters, adulterers and murderers, to be stoned to death; that God commanded Joshua to stone to death children for the sin of their father; and to seek and burn the cities of Canaan, slaughtering men, women and children. At no distant day, the Bible will be made to deny that God of immutable justice and goodness ever did or could sanction such deeds of treachery, of revenge and blood. Such a book man's only rule of faith and practice, and that rule infallible! Sad is human condition, if there be no surer guide to duty and to God than a book—thus changing with the changing opinions and circumstances of mankind!

But Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, or Solomon, comes to me and says—'I have a message from God to you. God commands me to do so and so.' How am I to decide whether the command is from God? My first, my only test of all revelations or inspirations is—Does the act, required to be done, accord with the Divine nature, with natural justice and equity, with the unchanging relations and laws of being? If prophet or apostle requires me to perpetrate some deed shocking to humanity, and to the principles of justice; if they require me to do what the reason and instincts of mankind pronounce to be treachery, theft, robbery, murder and assassination, then I want no other proof that they are mistaken. God never ordered man to do that which is a violation of Divine and human nature, of natural justice and equity, of very relation and sympathy between man and man. God is EVER TRUE TO HIMSELF. He never ordered man to violate the essential elements and laws of his being. I know that a God of love and justice never commanded a father to disinherit all his children but one, and give all he had to that one. I know such a Being never commanded a father to offer his son as a burnt offering to himself, even as a temptation. I know he never selected one portion of his children, made them his special favorites, and sent them to exterminate another portion of his children, that they might reap where they sowed not, and enjoy the fruits of others' labor without compensation. I know that a God of love and justice never commanded one man, or set of men, to go to a neighbor's house, or town, set their houses or towns on fire, butcher all the men, women and children, and take possession for themselves. I know that a God of love and justice never commanded the Israelites to invade the Canaanites—to burn their dwellings, and slaughter the men, women and little ones, in order to make room for themselves. I know that Justice, Equity, and Goodness, never made it a sin to plot and spare helpless infancy, and make mercy, kindness, gentleness, and pity, crimes among men. Whoever or whatever attributes such deeds of treachery, of wrath, of cruelty, of inhumanity, of revenge and murder, to infinite Benevolence, Justice, Equity, and Goodness, libels the Deity, and would hold up a Demon, as the kind and loving Father of mankind. It is impossible that God, by express revelation, could thus deny his own nature, as that is delineated in the physical, intellectual, social and moral nature of man, and in the spirit and precepts of the Christian Religion. THE SOUL OF MAN SAYS, SLAVERY AND WAR ARE WRONG; and the authority of no war in favor of injustice, cruelty, revenge, oppression and wholesale murder, can stand before the authority of the human soul in favor of justice, kindness, liberty, peace, human love and human brotherhood. The Bible must go down before the authority of the human soul, if the Bible sanctions war or slavery.

Man's only Accident—A daughter of Gov. Bobb, of Ohio, died in Cincinnati on Tuesday, while he was absent for the purpose of voting. She was well when he left in the morning, and dead when he came at night.

Man's only Accident—A daughter of Gov. Bobb, of Ohio, died in Cincinnati on Tuesday, while he was absent for the purpose of voting. She was well when he left in the morning, and dead when he came at night.

HUMANITY IS FAR IN ADVANCE OF THE BEING WORSHIPPED AS GOD BY THE JEWS—as that Being is represented in the penal code and the wars of the Old Testament. No power can reconcile Humanity to some of those deeds that are attributed to that Being by the Jewish writers. No subtleties of theology, no hair-splitting metaphysics, no fine-spun distinctions, no learned disquisitions, no mammoth commentaries, no sectarian accusations, can ever reconcile human nature to those deeds of wholesale plunder, wrath, revenge, and butchery,—for such they would be regarded, if perpetrated now, and such they were then, unless justice, equity, mercy, truth, goodness, are mere structures of time and place, and change as the opinions, maxims and customs of men change. A pro-war and pro-slavery—a man-stealing and man-slavery, as divinely sanctioned practices, under the cover of texts from the Old Testament; but, eventually, Humanity will gain the victory over them. They, and their pro-war and pro-slavery texts, must go down before the stern rebuke of natural justice and equity, and the unmistakable command of that God who speaks in the human soul. But for the support derived to slavery from the Bible by the pro-slavery church and clergy of this land, that sum of all villainy had ceased to blight the earth, and scatter the hearts of men long ago. Humanity had ere this pronounced its doom, and numbered it with the crimes that were, but for that book, as it has been construed. All the horrors which are embodied in the word SLAVERY, have found their strongest support from that book. God and Humanity—natural sympathy and affection, natural justice and equity—all the relations of man to man, and the obligations and duties growing out of those relations, have been and are still sacrificed upon the altar of a book. God and man have been regarded as mere appendages to the Bible. Both have been sacrificed, rather than admit the possibility that certain men may have been mistaken.

Where is the book that has caused the shedding of so much human blood as the Old Testament? Not one can be found. It was a settled maxim, said to have been given by God, that idolaters, and all enemies to industry, were to be put to death without pity—without mercy; it was a crime to pity or spare them; and under the sanction of this supposed divine law, from the days of Moses, Joshua, Constantine and Charlemagne, down to the Puritans of N. England, professing Christians have caused the earth to flow down with the blood of their fellow-creatures—all for the honor of God, and the spread of his worship. Under pretence of exterminating the enemies of God, to make room for his peculiar, favorite people, this entire continent has been depopulated of its tens of millions of original inhabitants, since it was first discovered by Europeans, called Christians. The mountains and valleys, the lakes and rivers, the main land and islands, from Cape Horn to the North Pole, have been made purple with human gore. Witness the influence of the Old Testament in regard to idolatry! See the wars of the Crusades, and the slaughter and burning of heretics, all under the Old Testament sanctions, not to suffer infidels and idolaters to live. The four quarters of the globe have been made a huge charnel house for man, under the sanctions of the Jewish Scriptures. Then, again, suffer not a witch to live! and under the sanction of this supposed divine law, were the brutal inhumanity and murders that have been perpetrated upon innocent, defenceless old men and women! It was the Bible that hung the witches at Salem, and the Quakers on Boston Common, as that book was understood; it was the Bible that sanctioned the murders of Cortez and Pizarro, in South America, and of the Puritans in North. It was the Bible—the Old Testament Bible—that kidnapped and transported and enslaved the Africans. It was the same text that led on the wars between Catholic and Protestant in Germany, in Britain and Ireland. The foundation of the guillotine and the gallows is a text from the Bible. All the governments of human will, of violence and blood, that now scourge Christendom with oppression, slavery, war, terror, groans and blood, have their sanctions in the Bible. The Divinity of no nation that ever existed, ever instigated his worshippers to deeds of more inhuman cruelty and injustice than the Being worshipped as God by the Jews, and by misguided Christians, is said to have instigated his devotees to perpetrate.

Why do professed Christians pretend such holy horror of the God of Mahomet? You cannot, dear Andrew, find one single deed which Mahometans perpetrated under the sanction of their Divinity, which Jews and professing Christians have not committed under the sanctions of their God. Talk of Mahometan heathens! Mahometan polygamy and concubinage! Go, read the history of Abraham, Jacob, Gideon, David and Solomon, and never again find fault with Mahometans, while you admit that God sanctioned their conduct. Talk of Mahometans spreading their religion by fire and sword! Go, read the history of Moses and Joshua, and the conquest of Canaan by the Jews. Talk of Mahometan cruelty, injustice, robbery, and murder! Go, read the destruction of the Midianites, Moabites, Amalekites, of Jericho, Ai, and the cities and towns of Canaan, as recorded in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges, and never talk of the horrors of Mahometanism, while you believe that the Being whom you worship as a God of love and justice instigated and approved those deeds that are attributed to him in the Jewish record. Professing Christians condemn themselves, while they condemn Christians nations for their atrocities done under sanction of their idols; for, while they insist that their God actually commanded and approved all which they ascribe to him by the Old Testament writers, they themselves declare that all the licentiousness, the pollutions, the cruelties, the thefts, robberies and murders; the outrages against humanity of idolatrous nations—were once just, holy and good; and were once perpetrated by the very Being whom they worship as God, and may again be commanded by him; and that if they should be, it would be their duty and privilege to do them. There is no Divinity on the records of religion, that ever perpetrated more unjust, unnatural, cruel and inhuman deeds than professing Christians insist that their God has perpetrated, and may perpetrate again.

Dear Andrew, I would vindicate the Divine Author of Christianity, the Father of men, for the coming of whose Kingdom of Love and Peace, and Human Brotherhood, I pray and labor, from the foul charges brought against him by the advocates and apologists of War and Slavery. I know that Christianity and Humanity, together the Being whom they call God; or, rather, I would say, their low, brutish, brutal conceptions of God. The God of Christianity and Humanity is Love, Justice, Goodness and Truth. He never did and never can, while he is what he is, sanction slavery or war.

But I must stop now. I go to dine with friends near by, and with some little children. It is a bright day. Indian corn is 35 cents (12 1/2 bushels); pork, best kind, 20 cents (14 per pound); best beef 3 and 4 cents, (24) per pound; Oats 12 1/2 to 15 cents per bushel; best apples 10 and 12 cents per bushel; good mutton one cent and half per pound, best wheat 75 and 80 cents per bushel. There is a bill of fare for you!

HENRY C. WRIGHT.

CALL FOR A BIBLE CONVENTION IN BOSTON.

FERRIS GARRISON:

It was with much pleasure I noticed your candid remarks on the Bible, in your last. In the main I agree with you. I was also amused and interested at your friend Mitchell's remarks on the same subject. This discussion promises to be a great one, and the object of my present communication is to call attention to a proposed Convention in this city for the consideration of this matter. You remember the Sabbath, or rather, the 'Anti-Sabbath Convention!' Some good was certainly accomplished by that meeting, but it always, in my estimation, bore the wrong name. It was not intended, as far as I know, by any, to do away with the Sabbath, but only to do away with a superstition connected with its supposed special divine authority, and some legal enactments connected therewith; and the whole movement, as I understand it, grew out of certain objections to free speech, or indeed any speech, on that day, on certain subjects of vital and reformatory importance, that were considered inconsistent with the business of the time! Its object then was, to promote such a view of the Sabbath as should make it even more instrumental in righteousness and truth. It should not, therefore, I think, have been called an 'Anti-Sabbath Convention.'

But as it was, it accomplished good; it opened the eyes of many to more rational views of the objects and observances of that day; it brought in collateral subjects; it exposed a great power in the hands of the priesthood, most unjustly abused by them; and it was the means of exciting many to deeper thought and reflection. It was certainly an unpopular subject for a convention; the convention took a very unpopular name; but, notwithstanding all this, we were surprised to find so many in attendance, and so quiet a time. I remarked, I remember, at the time, that nothing could have been more unpopular, nor even a convention to consider the claims of the Bible to divine authority. In this last matter, a great subject of curiosity would have been proposed—a matter which has excited the attention of all reflecting minds, and crowds would have flocked to have had their doubts confirmed or removed, and the meeting would have been comparatively popular. But think of an anti-Sabbath convention! Yet notwithstanding the unpopularity of the name, and as I think, a misnomer, we were rejoiced to see so goodly and so quiet an attendance.

But a feeling pervaded my own mind, all the time, that the true ground of the evil sought to be removed, had not been removed, had not been reached. I well remember, too, a remark of Parker Pillsbury, in a speech on the occasion, one evening. We have attacked (said he) the church and the clergy, and now we've come to the Sabbath, but we haven't laid the axe at the root of the matter yet! That is true. That root of the matter is the Bible; or rather, the Bible as commonly received—the Bible as authority—the Bible as our Master—the Bible as an infallible book, as a unit, as the production of the Divine Mind, as a perfect whole. This is, truly enough, the foundation of the most evil, the most obstruction to all good reform, the most sectarian division and strife, the most war and bloodshed. It is the Bible, in this sense, that has given rise to the church; it is the church that has produced the clergy; and it is the clergy that has caused the land with their arrogance, inhumanity and conceit. This is going to the foundation of the evil. It is high time that this subject was introduced to a popular convention by the reformers. But I would not have it called an anti-Bible convention. No, sir. I would not do away with the Bible, any more than with the Sabbath. I would simply do away with the preposterous idea that the Bible is the production of the Divine Mind—a unit—a perfect and infallible whole, even after allowing the exceptions generally conceded, of errors and interpolations in the various translations. I agree with you, my dear sir, that the Bible never was intended for any such thing, that it is simply a collection of Jewish and Christian writings, issued hundreds and thousands of years apart, with no design, and no idea, on the part of the writers, of the Deity, that they should ever be bound up into a book, to be used as authority, to trammel men's thoughts, or to be exclusively read in churches.

I agree also with you, that, in losing our traditional and educational notions of this book, we may greatly gain in our estimation of it; and I am sure that there are certain high, psychological principles which may be applied to its relations, which will elevate even many passages, and some books of the Old Testament, to a high and sacred ground. And those principles, in our time, are getting, every day, to be better and better understood.

But it is not my purpose here to offer a theory of interpretation, but simply to say what I have said, that a Bible convention is now called for, as indispensably necessary to subvert the cause of universal reform. I would call it a Bible convention, in the same sense in which I would call a physiological convention, or a scientific convention, where the objects might be, while many things were opposed, not to oppose all science, but to consider the general subject. And I am sure, let it be called in the name of Reform, in the name of Anti-Slavery, in the name of Peace, in the name of Temperance, in the name of all Social Progress; and let it be with the greatest seriousness and deliberation, befitting so high a subject—one so closely connected with the most sacred impressions and prejudices of the people, and we may confidently rely on a full attendance, an interested meeting, and a profit to the cause of humanity, which will be felt in every branch and movement of its progress.

W. M. F.

EXPLANATORY LETTER.

FAIRMOUNT, Ohio, Nov. 18, 1848.

DEAR SIR—I have noticed with surprise, the publication in the Liberator of an article signed by Dr. Ruggles, in which my name is mentioned. The article, so far as I am concerned, is grossly false, and I have good reason to believe that Ruggles knew it to be so when he published it. I will make a brief statement of the facts, and leave you to act as your sense of justice shall dictate.

I became satisfied that I could not spend as much time at Northampton as I there prospect I should be obliged to, to receive benefit from the treatment, and proposed leaving on Monday morning, and settled my bills the day previous. Wilcox offered to get a horse and buggy, and carry me to town to take the cars. He did so; and the first intimation I had of his leaving that morning was, on the road to town he stopped to get a bundle of clothing. When I found that he was going to leave in that manner, I protested against it, and entreated him to return, telling him that Ruggles would think that I was concerned with him. I told him that if he did not go back, I would not go in such a manner. He said that Ruggles had abused him; that he was keeping him to get his money from him; that Dr. Denniston told him that he was well, and ought to have left long ago, &c. &c. I found that no praiseworthy mine would turn him from his purpose; and being anxious to reach New York that evening, I went on. He procured some one to drive the horse back, but I intended to pay Wilcox the horse-hire, but, as he would not return, I sent the money by the man whom he had hired to drive the horse back, requesting him to hand it to the owner for the use of him, and entered the cars. I saw no more of Wilcox, until we arrived at Springfield, when I saw him get out of a second class car. I barely spoke to him. I had no more agency, I was no more responsible for his departure than myself; he leaving against my strongest wish and most earnest entreaty. I was anxious to be in New York that night, and did not

feel it my duty to return, as I could not benefit Ruggles by so doing. When I arrived in New York, I wrote to Ruggles the circumstances as they occurred, stating that he might think that I had an agency in getting Wilcox off. I also requested him to see the owner of the horse, and if he had not got the pay for him, if he would let me know, I would remit it to him, not wishing that he should suffer loss, although Wilcox hired the horse. (I did not know the owner's name, or I should have written him.) I supposed that I had done all in my power to exculpate myself from even suspicion in the matter, and it had passed entirely from my mind, until a short time since my attention was called to the fact of my name being dragged before the readers of Massachusetts newspapers in such dishonorable connection.

I have no fear of the publication of such charges doing me any injury in the mind of any one who knows me, and I hate to stoop so low as to deny a gross slander. Were R. differently situated, I should prosecute him at once for the libel, but his case seems a hard one for this life, and excites sympathy rather than sterner feelings. He has had nine years, ever since I was acquainted with his situation, else I should not have visited his establishment as I did, very unfortunately for me, as it seems. Still, he has done me great injustice, which ought to be rectified in some manner.

I have thus made as short a statement of the facts as I can intelligibly do. You can satisfy yourself as to its truth, and do what your sense of propriety shall direct.

Respectfully yours,

S. MARSHALL.

[It is only an act of simple justice to Mr. Marshall, to publish his letter entire. We are glad to receive this explanation, because the brief acquaintance we formed with him at Northampton led us to regard him as a man of true self-respect and integrity. The behavior of Mr. Wilcox appears to be inexcusable. We hope he will speedily redeem his character by making the amends honorable to Dr. Ruggles, whom he has so wrongfully defrauded.]

—Ed. Lib.

ARRIVAL OF THE CAMBRIA.

The British mail steamer, Cambria, from Liverpool, Nov. 18th, and Halifax 21st at 10 1/2 P. M., arrived at New York at 10 o'clock on Saturday, after a pleasant voyage of 14 days.

Ireland continued tranquil, and no further action would be had relative to Smith O'Brien and his co-conspirators, till the 15th Nov., at which date the writs of error were made returnable.

The news from the continent of Europe is of principal interest. Vienna capitulated on the 31st October, and was immediately occupied by the Imperial troops. In Italy, the hostility of the Lombard population had been manifested in various places, by sanguinary conflicts with the Austrians.

The recognition by Great Britain of the Republic of Liberia has just been announced, and a treaty of commerce is understood to have been arranged. This State was founded by the American Colonization Society in 1820, and continued as a colony under the care of that body until last year, when it was formed into an independent government. A similar recognition has also been obtained from France.

Postal Arrangements.—The much-expected postal news which existed between the United States and our Government is finally arranged to the satisfaction of both Governments. The arrangement has yet to go before the American Congress for formal sanction.

The Hermann.—The Ocean Steam Navigation Company's ship 'Hermann,' Capt. Crabtree, arrived off Cowes, late of Wight, on Sunday, at 8 P. M. The voyage from New York occupied 16 1/2 days, and was protracted by an accident which occurred to the Hermann's largest engine on the 2nd of October, when the part which connects the crank with the side levers gave way, the shock arising from such mishap cracking both the side levers of the larboard engine. The disabled machine was immediately thrown out of gear, and the remainder of the voyage, (the starboard one) sailed by the sails.

The Cholera.—The aggregate returns begin to look formidable. In London and its vicinity, the deaths reported last week were 65; whilst the number of fresh cases reported daily varies between 10 and 20.

It is, however, in Scotland where the disease still commits the greatest ravages. No fewer than 465 cases have occurred in Edinburgh and vicinity up to the 8th inst., of which 245 proved fatal, 54 recovered, whilst 171 were under treatment, or the result not stated. On the 8th inst. only 27 new cases were reported, whilst there were 49 on the 7th. At present, the great manufacturing towns and districts have been cleared of the scourge, and we sincerely trust that they will continue to be exempt from attacks.

The maldy, however, has appeared on the northern coast of France, at Dunkirk. Only 16 cases of cholera had occurred in Hamburg up to the 6th inst., of which 12 were fatal, and 4 recovered. The social duties, and the personal privileges of 35,000,000 Frenchmen.

Depopulation of Paris.—This city has been deserted by so large a part of its fluctuating population, that the number of apartments now vacant, and to be let, is estimated at 63,000.

Letters from Linn of the 26th, published in the Augsburg Gazette of the 4th inst., contain the news of the defeat of the Hungarian army, which consisted of 15,000 men, for the most part irregular troops. The rout was complete. The Hungarians were compelled to cross the frontier in the greatest confusion.

Vienna, Nov. 3.—The damage caused by the fire and the bombardment has been much exaggerated. Nothing certain is yet known as to the number of the killed on the side of the Viennese. It is said to amount to as many as 1,500. The army has also lost a great number of soldiers, and many officers, but it is forbidden to the officers to disclose the amount.

The Jews.—On the 1st of this month, the decree for the complete emancipation of the Jews of the Roman States came into force. They are thereby declared fit for the exercise of all civil rights. The year 1848 is an amazing one. The changes of the forms of government are, however, less surprising than the abandonment of the Ghetto by the Jews of Rome.

An Atrocious Murder.—The Pittsburgh Gazette says: An old hawkes-colored man named Jackson was brutally assaulted and beaten on Thursday afternoon, at a German tavern in Ross township, by some five or six drunken young men or boys from Franklin township, in this county, and Cranberry township, Butler county. The old man was so horribly abused that he died at three o'clock on Friday morning.

Mr. Lawless, of Monaca, a man about 75 years old, was the person killed on the Western Railroad, a few days since. He was somewhat deaf, which prevented him from hearing the alarms of the conductor.

The N. Y. Sunday Dispatch says that Barnum, the famous showman, has realized \$750,000 by his latest in hitting the public taste. Forrest it puts down as worth the comfortable sum of \$300,000.

The Western Times, an English paper, says that sixty clergymen of the diocese of Winchester, who had had apostolic communion conferred upon them, have taken out certificates to enable them to sport with dog and gun. Another paper says the statement is below the truth.

The Next Congress.—So far, 77 Whigs and 50 Democrats have been elected to the next Congress, being a whig gain of 14 members.

TO THE BENEVOLENT.

The Managers of the 'TEMPORARY HOME FOR DESTITUTE CHILDREN' ask the aid of their fellow-citizens in continuing an institution, which even a short experience has shown to be so much needed. In this city, there are a large number of children, who are, from various causes—the imprisonment, vice, or death of parents—left without a home. Some can be readily disposed of—adopted or placed in families in the country, and thus removed from evil influences to good. For nearly two years, by the exertions of a few individuals, a 'Home' for the reception of these 'little ones' has been sustained in Albany Street, and nearly two hundred and fifty cases each year provided for at a very small expense. But for our narrow means, a much larger number might have enjoyed its benefits.

The Benevolence of Boston will not, surely, allow so benevolent a plan to fail. A single visit to the institution will be enough to convince any one of its importance, and interest them in its continuance. Under the excellent superintendence of Mrs. ELIZA GARNETT, it promises the best results. But we are sorry to add, that the plan—already in such successful operation—must be abandoned, unless further aid can be secured. Your assistance is earnestly solicited.

Contributions of money may be sent to Mr. H. M. CHASE, Treasurer, 13 Long Wharf, and provisions or clothing, to the HOME, 35 Albany Street, care of Mrs. GARNETT. Boston, November, 1848.

ONE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS.

THE WESTERN SERIES will be continued as follows:

NORTH BROOKFIELD, Saturday evenings and Sunday, Dec. 24 and 25. To be attended by Samuel May, Jr., and Stephen S. and Abby K. Foster.

SPRINGFIELD, Saturday evening and Sunday, Dec. 29 and 30. To be attended by Lucy Stone, S. S. and A. K. Foster, Agents of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, An Agent of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture in Charlton, Friday, December 1.

LUCY STONE, An Agent of the MASSACHUSETTS A. S. SOCIETY, will lecture as follows:

West Brookfield, Friday, December 1. Warren, Monday, " 4. Thorndike Village, Thursday, " 7. Enfield, Friday, " 8.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE N. E. NON-RESISTANCE SOCIETY.

At a recent vote of the Executive Committee, notice is hereby given, that the Annual Meeting of the New-England Non-Resistance Society for 1848 will be held at BOSTON, commencing Saturday evening, the 30th of December, and continuing through the ensuing day. It is desirable and will be expected that Henry C. Wright return from Ohio in season to be present. Business of unusual importance will come before the Society. All members and friends are therefore desired to govern themselves accordingly.

Friendsly papers will confer a favor by aiding to extend this notice.

ADIN BALLOU, President.

WORCESTER COUNTY SOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Annual meeting of this Society will be held in North Brookfield, on Saturday evening, and through the day on Sunday (Dec. 2 and 3), commencing in the Town Hall on the first named day, at 6 o'clock, P. M.

The members and

POETRY.

FROM THE HAVENHILL GAZETTE.

"SPEAK FOR THE RIGHT."

Impromptu.—BY JAMES RICHARDSON, JR.

Better one, single and alone,
By Truth and Right made strong,
Than a faithless band of a thousand men,
Contenting for the Wrong.

Better a little village, where
Ten righteous poor are found,
Than mighty Sodoma, rich with gold,
By Sin and Falsehood bound.

Better a little State, whose sons
With tyrants will not band,
Whose toil-worn hands are clean from blood,
Than a broad and conquering land.

Better a Church of two or three,
Gathered in Jesus' name,
In whom the fire of love to man
Burns with a deathless flame;—

Who, like 'the good Samaritan,'
Ne'er pass the sufferer by,
Nor leave those fallen among thieves,
Amid their woes to die.

Who call the scorned and trampled slave,
A man, a brother man;
And speak for Justice and for Right,
In spite of human ban.

Better a Church of two or three,
Thus to Christ's spirit true,
Than a multitude who call him 'Lord,'
Who yet God's will ne'er do.

Then, brother! fear thou not to stand,
All single and alone,
For the cause of Truth and Righteousness—
To wealth and fame unknown.

For angels, by the world unseen,
Shall come to strengthen thee;
And the Spirit of Almighty Truth
Thy Comforter shall be.

Better, then, single and alone,
By Truth and Right made strong,
Than with a flattering world to stand,
Contenting for the Wrong.

And to thy Soul, these words of Christ
A mighty host shall be,
To aid thy toils—'I'm not alone!
My Father is with me.'

UNITE! UNITE!

See how giant wrongs are tottering,
Feudal forms begin to shake,
Barbarous customs, now falling,
Make barbarian hearts to quake.
Let reformers meet together—
Let the strong in faith unite,
Hand in hand, and onward pressing,
Labor earnest for the right.

Partisans of scheme and charter,
Aid the struggle where you can;
Throw aside all party feeling,
Be decided to a man.
Onward push the car of progress,
Be not barriers in its way,
Men of truth, sleep on no longer,
Watch and labor night and day.

Working men, for right contending,
There's a rainbow in the sky;
Hope beams through the poor man's dwelling,
And the day of victory is nigh.
Band together for the action,
Count the cost, and span the ground;
Work in earnest, hope with reason,
And your fetters are unbound.

Statesmen laugh to see your quarrels—
Whilst you rave, they sit at rest;
As their portals hourly strengthen,
Daily you are more oppressed.
Up and conquer, be united!
For, divided, you must fail;
Quarrel ever, and be bounden,
Or unite, and conquer all!

HONOR TO THE TOLLING HAND.

All honor to the tolling hand,
Or in the field of mine;
Or by the hissing steam machine,
Or on the heaving brine.
Whatever loom, or bark, or plough,
Hath wrought to bless our land;
Or wrought around, above, below,
We owe the tolling hand.

In battles with the elements,
It breaks the stubborn wave;
It tames the forge, the shuttle throws,
And shapes the social bond.

It conquers climate, it tames the wave,
And bears from every strand
The sweetest, best of all we have,
Gifts of the tolling hand.

From the New York Tribune.
"I'LL DIE IN THE RIGHT."

They say that 'tis sweet for our country to die—
That flame is a mourner where patriots lie—
That glory shall ever our praises prolong,
Though dying for country, we die in the wrong;
But I envy not him, on whose laurel-decked bier,
The phantom of Glory has wasted a tear,
For rather than triumph when wrong heads the fight,
I would die as a man, in the cause of the Right!
I fear not to die—yet should this be my lot,
To fall on the field where the strife rages hot,
Or writhe out in anguish my last, dying day,
'Neath the wounds I have borne in the terrible fray,
Then Freedom shall claim me—her martyr I'll fall,
Nor die while attempting my brother to save.
Then Liberty's blossoms shall spring o'er my grave,
And my couch be bedewed with the tears of the slave!
A. M.

MEMORY, MUSIC, HOPE.

BY J. G. BOSTICK.

Thank God for Memory! This is the green dell;—
I hear the stream with musical ripples flowing;
The scent of flowers recalls my childhood well;
I feel the sun of new-born summer glowing;
And in my spirit's view, I see the stream,
And the bright fish that through the water gleam.

Thank God for Music! For the pleasant voices
Of boughs and winds and waters as they meet;
For every bird that in the wood rejoices,
For every note in nature's sweetest sweet:
To me, the lark's clear carolling on high
Reveals the whole wide world, bright summer sky.

Thank God for Hope! that, after life's short night,
Cheer'd by fair dreams and memories, I shall rise
To fields with never-fading verdure bright,
Unfading fountains, pure, unclouded skies,
And see the world, which will not pass away,
In the full sunshine of perpetual day!

LIGHT AND SHADE.

In shade and sunshine rolls the earth—
Half one and half the other;
Thus Friendship is allied to Mirth,
And Grief is Joy's twin brother.
Each forgets his sunny glade,
Each floods his path with ills;
So of a mingled world is made
Life's frail and curious web.

THE LIBERATOR.

"GOD NOT UNJUST AND CHANGEABLE" IN HIS ATTRIBUTES IN COMMANDING MEN TO PUT MEN TO DEATH.

TO HENRY C. WRIGHT.

DEAR FRIEND—Come, and let us reason together. The question for consideration is not whether the writers of the Old or New Testament were 'in some things mistaken;' (for this they might indeed be, when not under the influence of an infallible inspiration;) but the question is, whether they were mistaken in respect to those things which they assure us they received from God as his truth and law? You suppose that the record, (Joshua, 7th chap.) that God commanded that Achan and all he had should be destroyed, is false; and, by parity of reasoning, the record that God commanded Moses to destroy the Canaanites, and subsequent similar commands, on particular occasions, to go up to war against their enemies, are all false. It was all a mistake. The Almighty never commanded these things.

Now, my dear Sir, if the writers of the Old Testament were mistaken in respect to their testimony on this point, we can have no confidence in respect to their inspiration on other points. Indeed, you will concede that your principle requires you to place in the same category, all the Mosaic precepts which required the putting to death for various crimes. You may say that you do not question the divine inspiration of that part of their testimony which commands itself to your reason. This, however, is no proof of their infallible inspiration; for although testimony being subjective of right reason is evidence against such inspiration, its accordance with reason is not conclusive evidence in its favor. You would not allow to modern fanatics their claim to infallible inspiration, because they may prophesy some things which are no violation of your reason.

I would humbly entreat you to consider whether your principle does not subvert the divine inspiration of the New Testament also. Jesus Christ condemned the Jews for not believing Moses. 'Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me.' John v. 46. Did the Son of God condemn them for not believing a man who represented God as being 'unjust and changeable,' as you suppose many of the Mosaic precepts do? Do you say that the Savior condemned them for not believing that Moses wrote of him? What ground, I ask, had they to place confidence in the testimony of Moses concerning the advent of the true Prophet, while his testimony on other points was (as you suppose) totally incompatible with the attributes of Jehovah? This glorious fact, though not contrary to reason, was not accessible to it, without revelation. It would seem most reasonable to me, to rank the Jewish Lawgiver with impostors, on your principle; for it is difficult to conceive that he could be, with his superior abilities, mistaken with respect to all those commands being given him by God, which pertain to your objectionable category. But admitting that he was only mistaken in giving commands which represent the infinitely Holy One as 'unjust and changeable,' still I ask, does not the condemnation which the New Testament passes on those who would not confide in the testimony of such a fanatic, and the high commendation therein given him as one who 'was faithful in all his house,' go far towards invalidating the claim of the divine authority of the Register of all our hope of immortality? Surely we ought seriously to pause, before we adopt a principle involving consequences of such magnitude!

I admit that if you prove the Mosaic precepts to be 'unjust,' you prove also that they are no revelation from God. Divine revelation, right reason, and moral principle, are perfectly harmonious.

Permit me now to present to your intelligent mind some objections to your resolutions offered at the Richmond Convention. If I prove your foundation unsound, your superstructure falls.

The affirmation in your first resolution, that 'God is unchangeable,' needs qualification. He is unchangeable in his attributes, but not in the modes of their development. Immutability of righteousness is the basis of all divine law, but there is made of necessity a change of the law. Heb. vii. 12. Laws adapted to one dispensation, are not adapted to another. Such uniformity would be incompatible with the grand principle of progress. The Christian dispensation 'exceeds in glory' the Jewish. God does not now command his children to execute his holy vengeance upon his enemies, not because such an act would be 'unjust,' but because it is not as consistent under the present dispensation, as under 'the ministration of condemnation.'

I find what appears to me the source of error, in your second resolution. It is not true, I conceive, that 'all the relations of man to man, and the obligations growing out of these relations, are unchangeable.' Consequently, that it is not true, that 'whatever is now opposed to those relations and duties, ever was and ever must be opposed to them.' This principle appears to me to be contrary to reason and fact. Why should the relations and obligations of a progressive intelligent being be ever 'unchangeable'? Why should not such a being emerge from old relations, and enter into higher, involving higher 'obligations'? What are the facts in this case? The relation of human brotherhood, and the obligation of mutual love, which includes righteousness, are indeed unchangeable. But is the relation of parent and child, and the mutual obligations of obedience, submission, instruction, government and support, the same when the child is twenty-five years of age, as when he was five or ten? Is the relation of master and servant, and the obligations thereof, never varied by circumstances? May not the righteous divine law, which is the basis of all human obligation, so regulate the duties of human relations, that what, under one divine dispensation, is 'opposed to these duties,' may not be opposed to those duties under another? It is important to consider that the duties of a father to a child do not grow out of the natural relationship merely, but out of that relationship, and special laws of God pertaining to that relationship. These laws, though they are never violated righteousness, may vary under different dispensations.—e. g. Under the Christian dispensation, it is not the duty of a father to cause a son to death for idolatry. Why not? Is it because the act of stoning a man to death for this in itself so unrighteous, that God cannot justly require the father to do it, as Moses affirms he did? How then shall God judge the world? If the laws (I do assert) of sin is death, why may not the blessed Sovereign, the infinite Source of all being and of all good, make the father the executioner of his righteous retributive justice? So, if the Canaanites merited death at the hand of God, for their innumerable transgressions, (which I do not understand you to deny,) how was he any more unjust to inflict it by the hands of the Israelites, than by the sentence of the earthquake?

If, then, your second resolution is perfectly sound, on infer too much from the premises. If a Jew had killed his son for rebellion or idolatry, without a divine command, he would have acted contrary to the obligations of his paternal relationship; but the command of God created a new obligation, not founded on the natural relationship, but on the divine requisition. Such requisition is no violation of the nature and obligations of the relationship, because the relation does not involve the principle, that it would be wrong for the father to inflict a punishment on the son deserving at the hand of God, if God requires the father to do so, although it does involve the principle, that he has no right to do so without divine requirement.

On the third and fourth resolutions, I beg leave to

remark. In what sense do you consider the objectionable deeds attributed to the Divine Being by the writers of the Old Testament, are opposed to the spirit and principles of Christianity? Is Christianity 'opposed' to God's taking vengeance on his incorrigible enemies? Are her threatenings against them less denunciatory, or less terrible in their import, than those of the law of Moses? Does Christianity condemn those divine acts which your philosophy condemns? Hear her answer for herself. 'He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God; &c.' Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' Does not the Author of Christianity himself tread the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God? By what logical process, I ask, can you prove, that it is more 'opposed to the nature of God' to require men to stone the transgressors of his law to death, than it is to require his angels to cast them alive into the lake of fire? Rev. xix. 20.

It is evident that you object, not only to particular deeds, but to the principle of putting persons to death by divine authority, (as claimed by the writers of the Bible,) but to the act itself of putting to death by human instrumentality. You represent the act of Jael killing Sisera, as a sinful act of assassination. The divine command to the Israelites, to slay the Canaanites, &c., did not imply divine direction, or authority, to use all the deceptive arts, or all the measures, which they adopted for the fulfillment of that command. It is not necessary, therefore, for us to reconcile all that Jael, or Ehud, or others did, with the divine perfection, but only that which is claimed to have been done by the authority of God. In your quotations from the Old Testament, especially in your letter of Oct. 20th, there are many objectionable matters, which God never commanded. We speak of the Bible as the Word of the Lord, but it contains the words of wicked men, and the words of the devil.

I ask for your proof, that it was any more unjust or inconsistent with the nature of God, for him to smite Sisera with the nail of Jael, or Ehud with the dagger of Ehud, than it was for him to smite Herod with worms, when all were sinners deserving everlasting death? How do you prove that it was more unjust to slay the Midianites with the sword of Israel, than it would have been to have slain them with the pestilence? It may be said, that the promise of perishing of many women and children, by disease or earthquake, is the consequence of natural laws. I reply, that what God by natural laws, he does himself; and that it is no more just to perpetrate moral wrong, by the laws of nature, than by any other means.

Although under the Christian dispensation, the retaliatory precepts of the Jewish code are abrogated, and God gives no command to one nation to destroy another, it is matter of fact, that he still uses human instrumentality in accomplishing his righteous judgments against the workers of iniquity. The Roman army was as much the rod of the Lord's anger against Jerusalem, as the Assyrian was under the previous dispensation. It is under the present blessed dispensation of 'grace and truth,' that the prophetic word, concerning the pouring out of the vials of divine wrath, and the dashing to pieces the nations of the earth, is to be fulfilled, in part at least, by human instrumentality.

If the judgments and ways of an infinite being are unsearchable, and past finding out, by finite minds, (which reason itself must admit,) it is certainly unreasonable to impeach those judgments and ways, because they are, in some respects, inscrutable.

It appears to me that your theory (which I review respectfully and earnestly entreat you to review,) casts a dark pall over the entire Charter of our eternal hope. If 'holy men of old spoke (not) as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' in respect to the commands to which you object, we have no assurance that they did so on any other occasion. And as Jesus Christ and his apostles recognize the commands to which you object, as the inspiration of the Eternal Spirit, by sanctioning without such exception, the general testimony of the prophets; it follows, if you are correct, that they also were mistaken, and consequently, their own testimony is not reliable. We can, therefore, have no knowledge of the divine forgiveness of sin, or of a future state, beyond what our own reason can furnish. If the foundations are removed, what can the righteous do?

I have only to add my grateful acknowledgments to your mutual friend, for his kind liberality in giving my articles a place in his columns.

Truly yours,

HENRY GREW.

MYSTERY AND FAITH.

SOUTHBORO, Nov. 14, 1848.

TO HENRY C. WRIGHT:

SIR—I felt much interested in your remarks in the Liberator of the 10th inst., in which you set forth the misdeeds, said to be done and approved of by God. You inform us the minister called them mysteries, which required the exercise of faith to reconcile with his divine goodness, mercy, and unchangeableness; which Mystery and Faith you assert, in the commencement of the affair, was a laughable matter, and therefore not satisfactory. Now I feel as much disposed to exhibit your position as equally ridiculous and laughable as the former position, and requires both the same amount of Mystery and Faith to support and believe it; and that is, there is such a being as God, the great Maker and Creator of all worlds, angels, spirits, minds, thoughts, wills and bodies of men, who is all Love and Justice, and forever unchangeable; and having so made man, I would enquire of you, by what possible means man can acquire ability to be certain that he will not violate the laws of Love and Justice, unless God voluntarily bestows it upon him; and that all violations of Love and Justice (if so bestowed) arise from his partiality in the bestowment, and thus render man a mere passive being, not responsible for either good or evil?

FITCH WINCHESTER.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM A CLERGYMAN ON CAPE COD.

MR. EDITOR:

DEAR SIR—I thank you for your courtesy in so promptly publishing my letter, after your return to the city. I began to think that it was held over, that Mr. Pillsbury, or some other able, might publish an explanation which should appear simultaneously with it; but I little expected to be honored by so long an editorial from yourself. Whilst I am grateful for your courtesy, I am not thankful for the contemptuous epithets and sneering remarks you apply to me; they aided nothing in convincing me that I am wrong, or that you, Mr. Pillsbury, &c., are right. But I opine they were not intended for that, but merely to please the vitiated taste of the class of readers you have to write for. Only that I should do violence to the best of my inclination, and go contrary to the teachings of Jesus, I could render 'raillery for railing,' and retort the infidel laugh of 'boasted, hireling priesthood,' &c. and write a few columns on the subject of boasted, hireling editors, hireling lecturers, and a hireling press; but I forbear.

Your long editorial has not convinced me that Mr. P. is irreproachable or immaculate, or that your Society is now worthy of public support, whilst it endorses such sentiments as advocated by its lecturers. You expend a great many words in endeavoring to glorify Mr. P., and talk largely of his 'services' in abdicating the pulpit. Yes! 'abdicating' is the term. Was it such an abdication as Louis Philippe gave us a specimen of when he left the Tuileries?

Let me look at your editorial again, and be sure that you say he has 'made sacrifices.' Yes! that's the word. Indeed! of what kind? Not of money, I trow; for I'll engage he is far better paid now, as a hired lecturer, than ever he was as a hired clergyman. Not of mental ease; for when he was a clergyman, he had to prepare lectures, which you complimentarily say, 'without designing it,' would 'smell of the lamp,' 'be elaborately prepared for select occasions,' 'planned and polished, so as not to give offence;' and these, week after week, and year after year, in never ceasing variety. Now he can travel comfortably about with 'the same old song,' without any necessity of arduous mental application. He has surely made no 'sacrifice' of health; for his present vocation must be highly conducive of health. Perhaps you will say, he has 'made sacrifices' of many old and valued associates; but, most likely, he himself would say, his loss was gain,—for he exchanged them for others more congenial to his mind. But you say positively, 'the rulers, scribes and chief priests from upon him with indignation, and discarded him with contempt.'

Without stopping to question the accuracy of this statement, but admitting its correctness, where is the sacrifice? Atheists and infidels smile on him with complacency, and the irreligious receive him with pleasure, and hail his visits with delight; thus fulfilling the old adage, that

'Birds of a feather
All flock together.'

So that, on striking a fair balance, the advantage seems to be immensely in his favor—that is, according to his present views and feelings; so much so, that I cannot help thinking, he will scarcely thank you for your gratuitous encomiums on this score at least.

Your gracious editorial has by no means convinced me, either, that Mr. P. is not an enemy to all religion, 'the true as well as the false,' notwithstanding you affirm it to be 'a contradiction in terms;' that one cannot be an enemy to both at the same time. If you cannot see the possibility of such a case, you must be the subject of an obtuseness of vision, which I never supposed you possessed of. I can very distinctly perceive how a man can become such an apostate, as to be an enemy to all true religion, and, at the same time, have so much benevolence for a portion of the oppressed human family, as to be an enemy to a pro-slavery religion, which is a false, though assuming to be the true religion. An enemy to it, not because it 'steals the livings of heaven to serve the devil in,' but because it helps to crush down more deeply the oppressed. I think I shall always see thus distinctly, unless I should become so blinded by Come-outism that the 'light within me should become darkness,' which at present there is no danger of.

I hope for his own sake, that Mr. P. is not such an enemy as this, and that he will frankly state his position. I expect he will take the cue he is furnished with from head quarters, (pardon me, if I am too suspicious in supposing this to be the design of your editorial,) and say that, when at North Dennis, he only expressed opposition to all church organizations, and all ministers, as such. But church organizations was not the question. 'The religion of the country,' as your former letter stated, was the question at issue. I merely quoted the very closing words of what transpired, for the sake of brevity.

I must now go back a little, and if necessary, go back still farther in another communication, and give such a report of Miss Stone's lecture, as shall bear the most stringent criticism, and puff it beyond your insinuations of inaccuracy. After she had dealt in the most extravagant, sweeping, and unjust denunciations of all, of every name, every where, excepting one solitary church where Mrs. Foster had lectured—inferring that this exception was through her influence—and after I had made the remarks communicated in my last, Mr. Maynard rose and took exception to her statements, and referred to individual cases, where true religion was exemplified and enforced; and in conclusion said—'You are called Come-outers. Now it seems there is no difference between us as to what constitutes the principles of true religion;' and then referring to the religion, churches and ministers specified by himself and me, he asked, 'Do you advise the people to renounce such religion, come-out of such churches, and desert such clergymen?' Mr. P. certainly withdrew either 'praising or polishing,' answered, 'My advice to the people is, to scamp away from the whole of them as fast as ever you can.'

Now if he says that they meant by their sweeping charges and denunciations, only to condemn all church organizations, and not the true religion contained in any of them, so far it will be satisfactory; but that will be an acknowledgment of yet greater wrong, viz. that of acting dishonestly. Inasmuch as whilst the reason exhibited, and pressed upon the people, why they should come out of the churches, was their pro-slavery character, the hidden and secret reason was, a hostility to all church organizations. Take for him, if you please, whichever horn you choose.

You say for him, 'what if he takes the Quaker view?' (By the way, I think the Friends are libelled by the comparison.) Well, what if he does take their views of what you please to term a 'hireling priesthood,' and should take all their arguments against the 'hireling priesthood' of a law established church, by which they were persecuted in the old country, and twist them to apply to the clergy of this country? He would only be borrowing their old arguments,—as was done, in my hearing, at your Anti-Sabbath Convention; but he could never use them in so good a spirit as they did, unless he altered considerably for the better, in the temper of his mind.

If he holds such views, he has a perfect right to do so, but let him give an honest expression to them, and not make the anti-slavery cause the means through which covertly to promulgate them.

If, as you seem to intimate, the American Anti-Slavery Society will approve this course of its lecturers, then I prefer the three following serious charges against it, and would exhort it to do its 'first works.' 1st, Fraud. 2d, Dishonesty. 3d, Inconsistency.

1st, Fraud. By obtaining money under false pretences. The committee solicits and obtains subscriptions largely from church members in England, for the sacred purpose of obtaining the liberation of the slave, whilst it knowingly and designedly expends these funds in endeavoring to break down all churches—those which are anti-slavery, as well as those which are not.

2d, Dishonesty. In vigorously promulgating the doctrines of come-outism, secretly as the means of breaking down the existence of slavery; whilst the grand and primary object is to advance a spirit of hostility to all churches, and to 'advise the people to scamp away from the whole of them, as fast as ever they can.'

3d, Inconsistency. In that, whilst it denounces, damns and anathematizes all who vote under the government, as thereby aiding to promote slavery. That whilst they abuse and vilify all who, in the most indirect manner, aid to sustain American Slavery, whether they do it ignorantly or not, they themselves knowingly, and wilfully, do 'aid and abet,' sustain and comfort this sin of all villainies, by purchasing, selling and using various articles, the product of slave labor, thus helping to rivet the chains faster upon, and to assist in pressing the blood from the poor child of oppression.

1st. That to be consistent, it should discountenance the use of all articles, the produce of slave labor, as did the English abolitionists when they crushed colonial Slavery, and as numbers of the Friends do in this country.

2dly. To be 'honest,' the lecturers must be made to advocate slavery abolition on its own merits, and cease from making it merely a medium of attacking all churches.

3dly. To avoid the charge of 'fraud,' they must do the work they obtain the money for accomplishing, and not do that which is repugnant to all the views and feelings of those who benevolently contribute to their funds.

Finally—If it continue to be fraudulent, dishonest, and inconsistent, all who have entered into such an organization, which is supported by such inquiry, had better come-out instantly, lest they be partakers of their plagues.

I am yours indeed,
EDWARD MORRIS.

PEACE—UNIVERSAL PEACE.

A Congress of Delegates from various parts of the world, for the promotion of Universal Peace, was held in Brussels in September last. Elihu Burritt, who was present, has given an interesting account of it in the Christian Citizen. Here is an extract:

M. Roussel, the elegant and accomplished advocate, whose every voice was the language of peace—whose every gesture and word seemed to take its grace from the spirit of good will to man—next mounted the tribune, and was received with acclamations of welcome. When silence was restored, he bowed over the tribune, and, leaning forward, he said, in his sweetest tones: 'I am going to ask you to proclaim, by a unanimous vote, that the moment for a universal disarmament has come.'

The whole assembly was struck with the earnest simplicity with which he put this important proposition. 'In this listening audience,' he continued, 'there are a great number of persons, who must be astonished at these absolute words. What! say they, disarm all at once! destroy the security which we enjoy! to cause our defenses to disappear in the face of foreign nations? Gentlemen, let us begin by examining the foundation upon which we have erected our principle upon which that which is based which impels men to kill their fellow-creatures, who would be little disposed to do it unless constrained by obligation. It is war that engenders armies. You have just condemned war; you must also condemn armies. B. t. says one, it is not war that we wish from armies, it is an armed peace. Armed peace is two words, which mean an enormous coupled together. It is like saying a living corpse! Dancé, I believe, has said, 'Si vis pacem, para bellum'—if you wish for peace, prepare for war. But would it not have been much better, had he said, 'if you wish for peace, prepare for peace?' You desire a certain result, and you prepare for a contrary cause. This is an absurd genre. An enormous contradiction, which has only survived because it had a Latin proverb to lean upon! After proceeding in this strain for some time, he concluded by saying: 'Disarmament is a necessity of civilization because peace is a necessity of civilization. Perhaps we may not see it; but without taking the word of a prophet, our children will see it. We will one day embrace each other, and cease to kill their kind.'

Henry Vincent followed; and no one could do it more in harmony with Roussel. Each was the most eloquent of his countrymen present. The genius of each was inspired with good will to man, which shone in their countenances. The Belgians enjoyed the rich treat of his eloquence, and welcomed him to the tribune with an English demonstration of enthusiasm. Nor did he disappoint our expectations. He again raised the assembly to a state of delectable exaltation, not so much by the force of brilliant ideas, as by that heart power which he gives to his burning words.

After he had given his burning words, Roussel gave back still farther in another communication, and give such a report of Miss Stone's lecture, as shall bear the most stringent criticism, and puff it beyond your insinuations of inaccuracy. After she had dealt in the most extravagant, sweeping, and unjust denunciations of all, of every name, every where, excepting one solitary church where Mrs. Foster had lectured—inferring that this exception was through her influence—and after I had made the remarks communicated in my last, Mr. Maynard rose and took exception to her statements, and referred to individual cases, where true religion was exemplified and enforced; and in conclusion said—'You are called Come-outers. Now it seems there is no difference between us as to what constitutes the principles of true religion;' and then referring to the religion, churches and ministers specified by himself and me, he asked, 'Do you advise the people to renounce such religion, come-out of such churches, and desert such clergymen?' Mr. P. certainly withdrew either 'praising or polishing,' answered, 'My advice to the people is, to scamp away from the whole of them as fast as ever you can.'

Now if he says that they meant by their sweeping charges and denunciations, only to condemn all church organizations, and not the true religion contained in any of them, so far it will be satisfactory; but that will be an acknowledgment of yet greater wrong, viz. that of acting dishonestly. Inasmuch as whilst the reason exhibited, and pressed upon the people, why they should come out of the churches, was their pro-slavery character, the hidden and secret reason was, a hostility to all church organizations. Take for him, if you please, whichever horn you choose.

You say for him, 'what if he takes the Quaker view?' (By the way, I think the Friends are libelled by the comparison.) Well, what if he does take their views of what you please to term a 'hireling priesthood,' and should take all their arguments against the 'hireling priesthood' of a law established church, by which they were persecuted in the old country, and twist them to apply to the clergy of this country? He would only be borrowing their old arguments,—as was done, in my hearing, at your Anti-Sabbath Convention; but he could never use them in so good a spirit as they did, unless he altered considerably for the better, in the temper of his mind.

If he holds such views, he has a perfect right to do so, but let him give an honest expression to them, and not make the anti-slavery cause the means through which covertly to promulgate them.

If, as you seem to intimate, the American Anti-Slavery Society will approve this course of its lecturers, then I prefer the three following serious charges against it, and would exhort it to do its 'first works.' 1st, Fraud. 2d, Dishonesty. 3d, Inconsistency.

1st, Fraud. By obtaining money under false pretences. The committee solicits and obtains subscriptions largely from church members in England, for the sacred purpose of obtaining the liberation of the slave, whilst it knowingly and designedly expends these funds in endeavoring to break down all churches—those which are anti-slavery, as well as those which are not.

2d, Dishonesty. In vigorously promulgating the doctrines of come-outism, secretly as the means of breaking down the existence of slavery; whilst the grand and primary object is to advance a spirit of hostility to all churches, and to 'advise the people to scamp away from the whole of them, as fast as ever they can.'

3d, Inconsistency. In that, whilst it denounces, damns and anathematizes all who vote under the government, as thereby aiding to promote slavery. That whilst they abuse and vilify all who, in the most indirect manner, aid to sustain American Slavery, whether they do it ignorantly or not, they themselves knowingly, and wilfully, do 'aid and abet,' sustain and comfort this sin of all villainies, by purchasing, selling and using various articles, the product of slave labor, thus helping to rivet the chains faster upon, and to assist in pressing the blood from the poor child of oppression.

1st. That to be consistent, it should discountenance the use of all articles, the produce of slave labor, as did the English abolitionists when they crushed colonial Slavery, and as numbers of the Friends do in this country.

MERCHANTS, LOOK AT THIS!

A NEW STORE TO LET OR SELL IN NORTH ASHBURNHAM. SITUATED some three miles from the center, a vicinity of some twelve or fifteen acres, and all other water works of equal extent, two and a half miles from North Ashburnham depot on Oreling railroad, in a growing place, on account of the road making sale of wood, lumber, bark, &c., there being much woodland in this vicinity. No store short of three miles. It is intended to be a store of office in this place, which ought to be in this store. The buildings are new. A store has been kept in this place some three years. Rent low. For further particulars, inquire of JAMES FENNO, 41 Hanover street, Boston, Mr. TOLMAN, Union extension depot, or ALVAN WARD, near the premises.

N. B. It is believed that a capital of two or three thousand dollars would be sufficient for a person, who would deal justly and fear not, to get a fair living in this place with the rest of us.

A. WARD.
Ashburnham, Nov. 15, 1848.

WM. J. REYNOLDS & CO.
HAVE removed from No. 30 to No. 34 CORNHILL, and have on hand a large stock of all the SCHOOL BOOKS in general use, which, together with a general assortment of STATIONERY and other articles in their line, they offer to book-sellers and country merchants and others, who buy to sell again, at the lowest market prices.

JUST PUBLISHED.
'THE TIMBER,' a new collection of sacred music, by B. F. Baker and L. B. Woodbury, for choirs, congregations and singing schools.

FEMALE MEDICAL INSTRUCTION.
A COURSE OF L